

77 78 7 Ireland vol 7

A SECOND
ADDRESS
TO THE

Right Hon. the LORD MAYOR,
The ALDERMEN, SHERIFFS, COMMONS,
CITIZENS, and FREEHOLDERS of the City
of DUBLIN,

F R O M

CHARLES LUCAS, M. D. *K*

One of their REPRESENTATIVES in PARLEMENT.

C O N T A I N I N G,

An Answer to a New ADDRESS

To His LORDSHIP and the CITIZENS.



Manus haec inimica Tyrannis, Lege petit placidam sub Libertate QUIETEM.

D U B L I N:

Printed by ALEX. M'CULLOH, in Henry-street, 1766.

25 Jan. 1766

A SECOND

ADDRESS

TO THE

Right Hon. the LORD MAYOR

THE ALDERMEN, SHERIFFS, COMMONS

CITIZENS, and FREEHOLDERS of the CITY

of DUBLIN

FROM

CHARLES LUCAS, M.D.

One of the Representatives in PARLIAMENT

CONTAINING

An Answer to a New ADDRESS



TO HIS LORDSHIP and the CITIZENS



Printed by Alex. McCulloch, in Henry Street, 1866.

DUBLIN

Printed by Alex. McCulloch, in Henry Street, 1866.

1866



A SECOND

A D D R E S S

O F

CHARLES LUCAS, M. D.

My LORD MAYOR, and YOU my very worthy
FELLOW CITIZENS and CONSTITUENTS!

IMPELLED by a Sense of my Duty to my King
and Country, the sole Motive and Rule of all
my Actions, I apprised You of a Matter of a new and
extraordinary Nature, depending in Parlemtent,
with a View to receive your Instructions for my Con-
duct, or to put You in a regular Method of giving
just Opposition to the Measure else where, in Case
you should be too late for an Application to the House
of Commons, and should agree in my Sentiments on
that Matter.

This was the full Scope of my Intentions: And,
nothing less than so extraordinary an Emergency,
and the Shortness of Time, could have induced me
to offer my Thoughts to the Public, upon a Subject
of such great Importance, in such a crude and disor-
derly Manner.

But I have the Satisfaction of finding the Humani-
ty and Benevolence of my Constituents such, as to in-
duce them to overlook my manifold Faults and Er-
rors, and to accept the Intention for the Performance,
the Will for the Deed.

I could not in all this, have foreseen, that I should
have involved your Lordship, with the Rest of my
Constituents and Friends, in the Troubles that have
since ensued.

But

[4]

But as your Lordship daily proves, that no Pains or Care can be too great for You, in the Discharge of the high Office you fill with so much Dignity; give me leave to follow your great Example, and assure You, that all the Care and Labor I can possibly take in the Discharge of the Trust reposed in me, bring with them the only Reward I look for, the heart-felt Comfort of a self-approving Conscience.

As this is a Reward, which no Power on Earth can give, so it is a Reward, which no Power on Earth can wrest from me.

Two Things alone can heighten the Enjoyment; and these I have had the good Fortune to obtain; the concurrent Approbation of the Wise and the Good, with the Hatred and Obloquy of the Fools and the Knaves: These, You know, My Lord, are inseparable; whoever gains the one, can hardly escape the other. And, as both are produced by the same Cause, I enjoy both alike.

But I have a still greater Fund of Fuel for my Vanity; They who have raked Earth and Hell for Slander and Abuse, are forced to leave my moral and political Character unscathed; while my too bountiful Friends, over-rating my good Intentions, for Services, alas! I cannot boast, overpay my utmost Deserts with Honors, of which the first of the pure Patriots of Greece or Rome might be proud.

And proud of them, I confess I am, My Lord; For, not to be proud of such Distinction, is to be unworthy of it. The Approbation of the judicious, loyal, disinterested, and free, is to me the highest, the truest Honor; the only desirable Reward for a loyal and faithful Discharge of the Duties of the Station, with which I am intrusted by You. And therefore it is impossible that any worldly Consideration should deter me from the Pursuit.

Let this explaine to your Lordship and Honors, the Motive of my calling upon You again in this
public

public Manner. I am not ashamed to profess an honest Love for Fame, or a fair Reputation. With this, I can live content, without Affluence of Fortune, and die in Peace. And I think it a better Legacy to my Children, than this World's Wealth, got by the Wreck of Conscience and Honor.

Let others boast the Atchievements of their Sires, in accumulating Fortunes for them, no Matter by what Chance or Management obtained. Let them boast the Weight and Consequence they derive from such Fortunes. Let them vaunt of their Freedom in the Senate, their Independance on Power, their Security for loving and serving their Country, which their Riches give. Let them make their Riches the best Security they can offer for their Integrity, and suppose no Man honest, that is not as rich as they. Let them be as vain as they will upon this Stock, grow proud and insolent upon it; get Pluralities of Places, Pensions, Douceurs, and Compensations, in Consequence of the Influence of their Oppulence; and to the Insolence of Office, add the Insolence of Affluence. For such, My Lord, have we seen and heard.

I envy such, nothing they do, or can enjoy. And since from the Weight of their Riches alone, the Public derives all the Security they can give for their Honesty or good Behavior; who that is destined to sit in such Company, must not rejoice at finding his Pockets in no Danger of being picked?—Let such Men amass Fortunes more than ministerial; let them be cursed with the Riches and the Vices of a *Charters*; but let them not judge of others by their own corrupt Hearts.

Of this Class are some of those who from masked Batteries level their invenomed Shafts at me. Let their Condemnation, with that of the Righteous fall upon me, when any Man can say, I used a single sinister Art to increase my Fortune. Rather let *Spartan* Penury with Peace of Mind, be my Portion on Earth.

So

So much for anonymous Writers. And however numerous, however malignant the Throng, they shall move no Passion in me, but Pity and Contempt. I had rather my Conduct, than my Pen, should give hireling Slanderers the Lie; while I look down on the Multitude of such Wretches, that have got Places, Pensions and other Preferments for abusing and persecuting me, with the same Eye that a Victor viewed the Slaves that were chained to his triumphal Car, or who added to the Crouds that made up his Procession.

Yet, though I have somewhat to say to your Lordship and the Board, as well as to the Sheriffs and Commons, apart, for something singularly remarkable, though widely different in the late Transactions of both your Houses; I must beg the Indulgence of each, in postponing an Address to You on this Head, to offer you some Observations upon a Pamphlet inscribed to your Lordship and the Citizens, under the Titule of A NEW ADDRESS.

And new, indeed, it is, MY LORD: For, though the Author as yet declines the Light, it seems rather from native virtuous Modesty, than from any Degree of that Malignity, which overflows the Works of the late Writers of this Class in the City.

This amable Modesty is further conspicuous in the Terms in which this learned and well bred Writer declines declaring his Name. "It imports not," says he, "to declare who I am. Truth carries in itself sufficient Authority. As I am too insignificant to give it any Ornament, I will not adventure to do it Disgrace."

It is with extreme Pain and Diffidence in myself, that I differ in any Point, from this most modest, polite and respectable Writer. In this Instance however, he will pardon my differing from him: For, I beg leave to say, that the Author of such a Work cannot be so obscure, as that his Name should disgrace

the

the most learned Tract. And while his Eloquence gives all *Ornament* to his Subject, it is but reasonable to presume, his Name would give Weight and Force to Truth itself.

But while this learned Gentleman chooses, from whatever Motive he will, to conceal himself, it is improper to attempt any Inquiry into his Name or Station; such Detection is only for Delinquents. Ever modest Virtue declines the Light. Let this Writer's Name and Rank be what it may, his natural unaffected Oratory, benevolent Disposition, the gentleness of his Manners, and the goodness of his Design, in this Address, must add Dignity and Lustre to both.

Yet while I justly admire the many Virtues and Graces, that engage the Attention in every Period of this Performance, I must lament that I cannot subscribe to all his Positions, or his Arguments.

This, I flatter myself, arises from our not being agreed in Facts and Definitions; for as far as I can yet learn, it would be a Reproach to differ in Judgement, or Sentiments from my honored, though unknown Antagonist.

I am proud enough to be elated on the Character and Vindication drawn for me by this dispassionate Pen, p. 3. a Testimony which, if single, must counterbalance the utmost Perverseness and Malevolence of all the Detractors in Masks united.

At the same Time, I cannot be ashamed of confessing the Truth and Mildness of his Reproof, (p. 4) when he says, *the good Qualities*, he is pleased to see, *do not blind him to the Quickness of Disposition*, in his Antagonist, *prone, at Seasons, to push him into Errors or Misapprehensions, which nothing but the Goodness of his Heart can excuse.* Especially while he humanely as politely adds this Apology, *perhaps this Propensity may not so properly be titled a Fault, as Virtue in Excess.*

The

The learned Gentleman seems perfectly well acquainted with human Nature. And while he candidly does me the Justice to acquit me of all Suspicions of evil Design or Intention of Deception; he, not unreasonably supposes, that a well-meaning, honest Man may be hurried by his Passions, so far as to deceive himself as well as others. To do the Author Justice, I must recite his own Words;

“ I am sensible that he could not intend any Kind
 “ of Deception or Artifice by his said Address. I
 “ cannot suppose, I say, that he coolly took up his
 “ Pen and sat down in his Closet, with the least View
 “ or distant Desire of imposing upon you; I know
 “ him to be incapable of such a Baseness. But there
 “ is often a Species of Art, in the Warmth and
 “ Impetuosity of Nature itself, more powerful, more
 “ seducing than all the studied Figures of an elaborate Piece of Rhetoric; and by such Means, an
 “ Orator, when kindled by his own Passions, is apt
 “ to deceive himself as well as his Auditors.”

I quote this Passage, as it serves for an Apology for my painful dissenting from this very worthy Gentleman: For as a Man, and a Man of Sense, I must suppose, that he too has his Passions as well as I, though I confess, his appear to be more under the Government of prudent Caution, or perhaps calm Reason than mine. If I could fully assent to his Arguments, I should be proud and grateful in declaring my Conviction and it's Motives. But as that is against my small Stock of Judgement, I flatter myself, your Lordship and Honors will indulge me in explaining the Causes of my reluctant dissenting, and I am persuaded of the Indulgence of my learned and humane Antagonist; since an Heart like his can no more expect *implicit Faith*, than he would pay or exact, *passive Obedience*, or *Non-Resistance*.

We are perfectly agreed in the first Position for stating the Question, (p. 4.) in which indeed, all was, as the learned Author justly observes, *legal, customary, and constitutional.*

But, probably unfortunately for me, in the second Position, we differ too widely for Persons whose common View must be Loyalty, Liberty, and Truth. Here, he observes the Heads of a Bill were returned from *England* with a *proposed Alteration*, which he also says, *was all alike legal, customary, and constitutional.*

Now in this, I beg Leave to differ from the Judgment of my honored Friend, for so I must beg leave to call him; as Men must be Friends who have the same just Points in View, though they seek different Means to obtain them.

For, however necessary for the temporary Preservation of a distempered State, *Poyning's Law* was found; it must be confessed, that it wants all the material Requisites of a Statute: The whole parliamentary Power, in all it's Estates and Branches, is derived from, and held in Trust for those, who instituted Parlements, and established the national Constitution, before Parlements were framed or thought of. Those undoubtedly were the People, the Origin of all Power and Authority. Their Delegates then were fenced, and honored, and intrusted with all the Majesty, all the Prerogatives, Powers, Authorities and Privileges of the People, not for the particular Honor or Emolument of any Individuals, but for the common Good and Security of the whole Society, and the better to enable the instituted Legislature, to preserve the Constitution framed and delivered into their Care, Sacred and Inviolable, and thus to hand it down Secure to latest Posterity.

As Deputies and Trustees cannot depute or delegate the reposed Trust, without the Authority or Consent of their Principals, or their Ward; so the Parlement, without a Breach of the Original Com-

pact, cannot alter the Constitution of the Realm, by alienating, transferring, diminishing, sharing, or dividing, the Legislative Power and Authority with any Man or Body of Men whatsoever. Hence, the Acts of the infamous Parlement of that detestable Tyrant RICHARD II, which vested the whole Power and Authority of the Legislature in the King, and a certain Number of his Counsilors, have fallen under the Contempt and Condemnation of all succeeding Parlements, and are by all good Politicians considered as a Set of perjured Traitors, and Enemies to their Country.

But by *Poyning's* Law, the Legislature shared, transferred, and in effect, alienated their delegated Power and Authority; added two other Branches to the established Estates of the Nation, the chief Governor and Council in *Ireland*, where his Majesty is unquestionably represented, and his Majesty in Person in *England*. This Law, however necessary, as a desperate Remedy, for a desperate Disease, when made, must be confessed, at this Day, destructive and anticonstitutional, and in it's ordinary Misconstruction and Abuse, tends to the Subversion of the antient, legal parliamentary Government of this Kingdom. My honored Friend therefore, can not, upon cool Recollection, call this *legal or constitutional*, however unfortunately *customary* it may be found.

Then as for the *proposed Alteration*, there is no mention of that in the third Section of the Statute of the third and fourth of *Philip and Mary*, Chapter the Fourth, which explains *Poyning's* Law. This requires that all such *Considerations, Causes, Tenors, and Ordinances* as shall take Rise in either House of Parlement, and shall be thought fit to be passed into Laws, are first to be certified under the Great Seal of *Ireland*, by the Chief Governor and Council here, to the King and Queen, and their Heirs and Successors, in *England*, and are not to be passed into Laws,

in this Kingdom, 'till they are returned under the Great Seal of *England*, and then receive the Sanction of the three Estates of the Parle-
ment of *Ireland*.

Here then, I must take the Liberty to set my honored Antagonist to Rights. Heads of Bills, or Bills are not sent over to receive the *Royal Assent* in *England*, that can onely be given here, by the King in Person, or by his Vicegerent: And his Majesty has no Authority, from this or any other Statute I know of, in Force, to *propose* any *Alteration*, in any Bill, sent for his Approbation, from his Parle-ment of *Ireland*. Therefore, I must presume, my learned Antagonist, will retract his Positions, that this is *all legal, and constitutional*, because it has been sometimes unfortunately *customary*.

The third Position staggers me still further if possible. I am sure it must have dropped from the learned Addresser, through Inadvertency not Design.

In the last Paragraph on the same Page, he positively Asserts, that *it is his Majesty's unquestionable Prerogative to put his Negative upon any Bill or Law, framed by either House of Parle-ment in ENGLAND or IRELAND, as also to propose any Amendment that he shall judge expedient, save in Money Bills, or laying a Tax upon the People.*

Sure this must be made up of a Congeries of Typographical Errors, or some Mistakes of the Amanuensis of my honored Friend, which unhappily escaped his Notice. This Doctrine might be agreeable about the corrupt Courts of the STUART Race, or under Ministers of their Stamp. Thank God! we live not in such Days, as can give Sanction to any such anticonstitutional and tyrannical Measures. Had I not learned to pay great Respect to the ingenious Writer, I should expose this dangerous Position with Acrimony. But, as I am persuaded he will disavow the whole, and probably find, it was foisted in un-
known

known to him, by some missionary *Jesuit* in disguise about him; I shall restrain my Indignation, or to use my Author's Phrase, the *Warmth and Impetuosity of my Nature*, and content myself with coolly laying it open to his View, submitting the Correction of it to his own Judgement.

That it is generally received, that the King has a Negative on all the Bills, passing his several Parlements, I well know. But, I can venture to appeal to the Candor of our Author, whether or not the King in Fact, or in Effect, gives his Negative to any Bill. The learned Gentleman must know as well as I, that all our best Politicians hold, that when the King declines giving the Royal Assent to a Bill, he only lays it aside for further Consideration. Hence, Bills thus layed aside have been repeatedly offered in succeeding Parlements or Sessions, till they at length obtained the Royal Assent.

I will also venture to appeal to the Author's extensive Reading for a Proof of this Truth; that whatever the Usage of later Days may be found, with regard to the denying the Royal Assent to Bills, by the antient Institution and Custom, the King was bound to give an Answer to every Bill presented to him by both Houses of Parliament, for the Royal Assent.

The Reason and Necessity for this, are so obvious, that nothing can be offered against it, but the long neglect and disuse of the Law, for which the Parlements, not the People are to blame.

But however my ingenious Antagonist may get over this; I cannot suppose he will, after Consideration, attempt to support the later and more dangerous Part of the Position, *that the King has an undoubted Right to propose any Amendment he shall judge expedient to any Bills, proposed to be passed in his Parlements.*

I am

I am sure, upon being by this called back to his Recollection, my learned Antagonist must retract this dangerous and erroneous Position: He most assuredly, must know, that our King has no Sort of Power or Influence, by the Laws, and the Constitution, over any Bills brought into either House of Parliament, or through any Stage of their Progress, till they are passed both Houses, and presented to him for their Completion by the Royal Assent. I believe he will even confess, that his Majesty is not by the Constitution, supposed to know of any Bill, in any Stage of it's Progress, in either House, from it's Rise to it's being presented to him for the Royal Assent.

As his Majesty has his Prerogatives, in the Security of which the People are concerned, so the Parliament have theirs, under other Names, established by equal Authority, and for the same Purposes, the common Good of the State, whose Freedom and Happiness depend upon the exact Balance of the Regal Prerogative, and the Authority and Privilege of Parliament. Therefore every sensible, loyal Subject must think it his Interest and Duty to be as careful of supporting and maintaining the one as the other.

Neither Estate has a Right to take Cognisance of a Bill depending in either House of Parliament, until offered unto the other for it's Concurrence, or to the Crown for the Royal Assent. And if one House may not interfere with the Proceedings of the other in passing of Bills, how much more necessary is it that each should keep it's Proceedings clear of all Interposition and Influence of the first Estate.

If the Crown may *propose Amendments* to Bills, why not frame whole and original Bills? And if that should ever be the Case, in what would an *Irish* or a *British* Legislature differ from the shattered Remnants of the *Gallic* Parlements, which are forced to receive, register, or pass the *proposed Amendments*, the Mandates or Edicts of their mighty Monarch? — Sure nothing like
this

this could come within the Intention of this learned and ingenious Writer. He can not be a modern *French-man*, and a brave old *Franco-gallian* would have spurned at the slavish and unparliamentary Position, as every true *Briton* must. I hope the Author for his own Honor and the public Satisfaction, will disavow the tremendous Tenet, confess it some Interpolation, unaccountably crept into his Work, and *no way legal, constitutional, or customary*.

But I am confounded at finding a long Train of Consequences attending this Position, in the subsequent Page, which I can not conceive how to dispose of, consistent with the Respect due to the learned Author. If the Position be, as I must be persuaded it is, false, the Inferences fall to the Ground. But if otherwise, we must comfort ourselves upon some Part of them.

The learned Gentleman is pleased to console us, with a Position to balance the former, that *it is the unquestionable Province and Privilege of either House of Parliament in these Kingdoms, freely to accede to, or arbitrarily to reject any Bill so proposed to be altered by his Majesty, &c.* If such an Amendment might be proposed, which is contrary to my best Notions of the Laws, Customs, and Practice of Parliament, I can not see how it would be constitutionally acceded to. I hope it would be rejected by either House, with Contempt, and that judiciously, not as our Author I hope in a Mistake, calls it *arbitrarily*, as that belongs onely to despotic Power, which resides in no single Estate of our Legislature.

In the succeeding Paragraph we are told, that *the Laws and Constitution have made no Provision towards appointing or limiting the Manner or Matter of any Amendment or Alteration that the Crown shall please to propose respecting any impending Bill, however such Alteration may be laden with Novelty, or even with an Attempt at Innovation, &c.*

When

When a Person of so much Sense and Erudition, as our Author appears, can so positively insist upon this, I cannot sufficiently lament the melancholy State to which the Constitution of *Great Britain* has been reduced since I returned to this Kingdom! The *Stuart* Family, following the Advice of Flatterers and Puffers of Prerogative, claimed a despotic Dominion over the Laws, a Power to *dispense* with all Laws. They attempted to rule arbitrarily without Parlements, and committed every Outrage upon the Lives, Liberties, and Properties of the Subject, upon all the Laws and the whole political Constitution. But among the numberless atrocious Crimes, that make the Memory of that Stock hateful to every true Friend and Lover of our Establishment, no Mention is any where, that I can find, made of a Charge of *dictating Amendments or Alterations of Bills to their Parlements*. And in the long black Catalogue of their Vices, surely one of so deep a Dye as this could not be over-looked.

If this Alteration of our Author, in the Constitution of Parlements, was not made in the Regne of the *Stuarts*, sure I am, it was not made in the Regnes of the first or second Princes of the *Hanover* Line. The more than *Machiavilian* Minister of these Princes, never attempted, amidst all his destructive Arts, one that might have answered his baneful Purposes so well, as *dictating from Prerogative, Alterations or Amendments in Bills*. And may we not hope, that a Gentleman of the good Sense, which our Author displays, will not chime with the slavish Writers that disgrace our Days, or think he can hope to pay Court to any Man now in Power in either Kingdom, by introducing this worse than Jacobitish Position. He must know nothing, who does not know, that our present patriot King makes no such Demand as this, nor ever did or can exercise a Part of the royal Prerogative, that is not confessedly for the common
Benefit

Benefit of the Crown and the Subject. Is it not enough that Histories of *England*, of her Religion, Parlements and Politics, written with Craft and Subtilty by Jesuits and other Enemies of our happy Establishment, are published, vended and well received in *Great Britain*? and that some of the Writers of this Class are plucked from Gaols and Pillories, and put into Places and Pensions?—Why is this Time chosen to poison the Minds of the Subjects in this Manner?—And what can our Author mean by broaching these slavish Doctrines in this Kingdom, whose Citizens have in all Ages, in the worst of Times, asserted their Freedom with unblemished Loyalty?—He will not surely, say, that these are the Measures of the present Administration. O! no; that is impossible. He will therefore quickly explane or reject these dangerous Positions.

In the same Paragraph, our Author proceeds, from the Goodness of his Heart, no Doubt, to draw Conclusions, in which he will, I believe, be found to have led himself and some of his Readers into Mistakes.—He says, “ The Reason is that no
 “ Alteration, which the Crown can possibly propose,
 “ can innovate or be conclusive on the other two
 “ Estates, as it is equally at their Option to reject or
 “ accede to such Alteration. If they happen to ap-
 “ prove thereof, it then becomes their own Act.
 “ They are however, free in Prospect, they are not
 “ concluded thereby, the Gate of Repentance is
 “ never closed against them. If the Alteration pro-
 “ posed is temporary or of short Duration, it cannot
 “ innovate or conclude in any Thing beyond its own
 “ Term. The three Estates, with all their Powers
 “ united, cannot frame any Precedent that can con-
 “ clude against themselves. Laws instituted for Per-
 “ petuity are still subject to their Repeal. And a
 “ single Session, of sensible and incorruptible Mem-
 “ bers, is available for abolishing and tearing up by
 “ the

“ the Roots every Growth of Iniquity, of Treachery
 “ and Prostitution that hath arisen, from the Date of
 “ Time, in these our unweeded Gardens.”

From these Words, which from any other Writer, would be suspected to be crafty and insidious, we are to understand first, that no Mischief can possibly accrue from the Crown's proposing Alterations in Bills; and that onely because the Parlement has it in Option, whether to accede to, or reject such Alteration. May not this Argument be carried too far? I will answer for myself in the Affirmative, with great Deference to the learned Author. May not the same Argument be used for the King's taking upon him, as the *French* Tyrant now does, the sole Power of framing the intire Bills? For taking from both Houses of Parlement their Right of advising or counselling the Sovereigne or first Estate? For taking away the deliberative Voice of Parlement?—Where, says our Author, is the Mischief, since it is at the Option of both Houses to accede to or reject these Bills? Sure he could never intend this dreadful Subversion of our Legislature! No certainly, it must be all a Mistake. The Gentleman may perhaps insist upon this being the Case in *England*. He may know better than I. But sure I am, this never was, is not, and I hope never can be, the System of our Policy in *Ireland*. And God forbid, that this should be a Prelude to the attempting the horrid Change!

Secondly, by those Inferences, we are to understand, that the Mischief is the less, *because if the Parlement happens to approve of the Alteration, it becomes their own Act*. Good Heaven! MY LORD, how does this lessen the Evil? Are Matters the less reversed, when the Executive Power takes the Place of his grand Council, because they may reject his Advice! This, You see will go as much too far, as the former. Their even having a Power to receive Advice or Alteration proposed is tremendous

dous and dangerous, from the Power and necessary Influence of the first Estate.

Thirdly, We are, from those Inferences, to understand, that tho' the Parlement should agree to these like Measures, which God forbid! *they are not precluded; and if the Alteration proposed be temporary, the Innovation can not extend beyond its own Term: That Parlements can make no Precedent against themselves; because Laws instituted for Perpetuity are subject to their Repele; and that a single Session of sensible and incorruptible Members is able to abolish and tear up by the Roots every Growth of Iniquity or Treachery in all former Parlements.*

To these, with much restrained Warmth and Impetuosity, with much suppressed Indignation, I endeavor to answer;

First, That though Parlements or other inferior Courts can not be bound by Precedent; Yet, that Precedents have usually great, not to say too much, Weight in the Determination of all Courts. Else, why are they so studiously made and so assiduously resorted to, in all Debates, especially when in Favor of the too much abused Word, *Perrogative*, and against the popular, which is, or ought to be the regal Interest?

And, secondly, Though the general Evil or Good of a temporary Statute is but of it's own Duration, the Precedent is never failed to be occasionally quoted, as if of perpetual Obligation. If not so, there could not be such Sollicitude on one Side to establish, and on the other, to prevent the Establishment of Precedents.

Thirdly, That though Parlements may and can rescind or repele all former Acts, alter and abrogate all Laws, but those which established and guard the essential and unalterable, fundamental Principles of our Constitution; the second and third Estate, however wise, and inflexibly virtuous, and faithful, have it not always in their Power to repele obsolete and injurious Laws, and much less to pluck up by the Roots
such

such Plants as sprang up from evil Seeds, sown in former Times. The Reason, the Author himself strongly insists on, when he says, the Crown has an absolute Negative on Bills agreed upon by both Houses of Parlemtent. What then can *a single Session of sensible and incorruptible Members* avail? — Would *Poyning's* Law stand this Day a Reproach to every Part of the Legislature of this Kingdom, could our late or present incorrupt and incorruptible Lords and Commons hope to prevale in an Act to repele, or at least to correct and amend it? — I should be glad, our learned Author would point out the Instance, in which a single Session was able to prevale in rectifying the Back-slidings or Abuses of former Parlements, where what is called the Prerogative was concerned. If then, Parlements can not easily abolish Precedents, or repele Laws, that apparently make the Prerogative preponderate against the Privilege and Authority of the Parlemtent, and the Rights and Liberties of the People, put together; how cautious should faithful Trustees and Representatives be, in establishing Precedents, that may in any future Time be abused, or in enacting Laws to strengthen the Hands of the Crown, which when found ever so hurtful, are never found easily repeled?

Our very learned and well bred Author seems to make very slight of the Alteration made in the Heads of the Corn Bill. I have already shewn that this Alteration appeared to me injurious and anticonstitutionall; and this has not been contradicted yet, with any Color of Truth or Reason, by any Man of Sense or Manners, before our Author.

It is indeed to be presumed, as he does, that *a Design, either salutary or injurious, apparent or latent*, was couched under the *Alteration*. How does our learned Author and Friend answer this? — Why, in the succeding Paragraph, (p. 6,) we learn, that as both Kingdoms were apprehensive of a Dearth of Bread;

Bread; that as *England* never shut her Ports, in such Cases, against *Ireland*, our Ports and Stores should be equally open to her, in the like Emergencies; and that the King being the common Father of both People, it was incumbent on him to be alike attentive to the Necessities of both; that as *Ireland* began to take care of herself, and thought it was reasonable, they should be first provided for; yet that upon the Advice of his Majesty's *British* Council that his *British* Subjects were in Want, of which his *British* Council alone could be the competent Judges: why it was but fit, that the poor *Irish*, who have no Sort of Encouragement for Tillage, and could never yet obtain a Law for that Purpose, should be sacrificed to the Necessities of *England*, or in other Words, that the *English*, when Hungry, may eat up all the *Irish*, at a Meal.

I hope it will not appear, that I have strained an improper Construction, from the Words of my learned Friend. The Analogy between the two Kingdoms, can alas! in no Instance hold good: Agriculture and the Exportation of Grain, is encouraged by parliamentary Bounties in *England*. Therefore they have rich Granaries and Corn-factors. We have neither, and therefore hardly ever have Corn enough for home Consumption. *England* may afford to share her Grain with us, when we can never hope to help her, under our present Circumstances. Yet the Bill, as I have already shewn your Lordship and Honors, left it in the Power of the Crown, by the Advice of the Privy Council here, to share their Grain with their Brethren of *England*, as far as Self-preservation would admit. Who could ask for more?

Upon the whole, I think it has been made evident, in my first Address, that *England* was as well provided for, by the Heads of a Bill, as might be reasonably expected, consistent with Self-preservation, the first Law of Nature, and the Laws and Constitution

tution of this Kingdom. Therefore the Alteration, for I cannot call it Amendment, being unnecessary, was a wanton Exertion of Power, and insidious, if not injurious. And moreover, it has been made apparent, that the suspending the Law in Part, is a Repele of the Whole, and consequently, that the Benefit of spoiling this famished Kingdom of it's Corn, could not be confined to ENGLAND alone, as it is now pretended was the Intent of that Alteration.

These Considerations induce me to judge, that all the Arguments of our Author, on his seventh Page, are ill founded.

It is most certain, as the Gentleman observes, that he, whom he pleases to stile your zealous Representative, neither did nor can view these Matters in the same Light with the Author. And for this plain Reason; I see the Multitude, in all Ages, have payed their Court, by flattering the Crown, with extending the Bounds of the regal Prerogative, or rather unlimiting it. This has been the Cause of all the great Troubles and Revolutions in ENGLAND. The Ministers of the Crown have always been watchful and active in this Extension; while the Representatives of the People have been negligent and supine, to say no worse. Hence, several invaluable Privileges of the People have been swallowed up in the bottomless Gulph of Prerogative, which are not so easily recovered, as our Author seems to believe.

As I am thus made sensible, that the onely effectual Way of preserving the Constitution in Peace, is by keeping a just Balance between the Prerogative of the Prince, and the Privileges and Rights of the People, as well in, as out, of Parlemtent; ever equally watchful, of the the Rights of the Crown and the Subject, I feel Pain at every Pore, when either is attacked, and with all my feeble Force, instantly and constantly oppose the dreaded Innovation. — And as our Author more wittily

ly than seriously expresses it, (p. 8,) I do not *conjure up* *Groupes of Spectres &c.* But I behold the *Ministers of political Sin*, which endangers the *political Death*, or *Disease* of my Country, with Horror, which the Righteous cannot feel, and therefore cannot fear on the other side the Grave.

I find my learned Antagonist is as great a Stranger to me, as I am to him, or he could not so far deviate from his declared Candor, as to suspect me capable of the Fright he paints, or fall into the pathetic, but reflecting Expression in the next Paragraph, to wit; "I will in no Respect deceive or mislead You, my Friends."—This too planely intimates, that Mr. *Lucas* has; perhaps the Author will say again, not designedly. But this is somewhat too much. Let it however, for the present pass.

In the Sequel, I am called upon to give my Judgment of his Majesty's Measures and Intentions. Here, your Lordship and the whole City see how little this Gentleman knows of me. You know, I am no Flatterer; You know how often, and in what Terms, I have testified my disinterested Love and pure Loyalty to his Majesty, and my zealous and inviolable Attachment to his royal House. That I have always looked upon him, as not onely politically, but actually free from Blemish or Imperfection; that I know his Heart overflows with pure Love and Benevolence to all his Subjects, and that I have myself sensibly shared of his Royal Clemency, in rescuing me from the oppressive Hands of that detestable hoary Tyrant, a long Parlement, with a wicked Ministry, and certain iniquitous Rulers of this City. His Royal Touch healed the Wounds and Bruises, given my Country, through my Sides. You know my Words, my Writings, the Tenor of my whole Life and Conduct proclame my invariable Gratitude, Affection, and Duty. And when I forget the Deliverer of my Country, let my right Hand forget

get it's Function, and my Tongue cleave to the Roof of my Mouth.—In his Royal Goodness, I repose the most boundless Confidence.

But why is his sacred Name and Character to be hawled into this Controversy? Is it to be imagined, that he can look into Matters of this Nature? Are they not all left to his Council? Does not the Council refer them to one or two Servants of the Crown, who alter, report or reject them at Pleasure?

I honestly and openly confess, I have not the fullest Confidence in all those, that are put in Authority under him, in either Kingdom.

As I can have no View beyond a faithful, honorable Discharge of the Duties of my Sphere, I can see the Transactions of such Men with the most unprejudiced Eye. Let their Characters stand ever so clear of Reproach; I think it my Duty to suspect and to watch their Conduct; to oppose and censure their Measures, where I judge them wrong or injurious to my King or Country; and to promote, to forward and applaud them, when they obtain the Concurrence of my little Judgement; for I despise the Notion of Mysteries or Secrets in a Government like ours.

I am as willing as the Author, to give this extraordinary Part of their Conduct, the strictest and fairest Examination, and to point out how noxious or inoffensive this *ill-looking*, not *fair-seeming*, Alteration may be found.

The Author's Sentiments and mine, with Respect to *England* and *Ireland's* being Kingdoms separate and distinct, and independent of each other; p. 8, Paragraph the second, happily agree, all to a little Incorrectness, or rather Want of the necessary Precision of Expression, where he asserts, *that the executive Power of Ireland is vested in the King of England*; and draws the following Inference, *that the executive Power, or the Dispenser of that Power, must reside in England*.—The Gentleman might, with

with equal Truth and Propriety have sayed, that this Power is vested in the Elector of *Hanover*. The Fact is, that the King of *Ireland* became, as the King of *Scots* after, and the Elector of *Hanover* since have become, King of *England*. The Executive of *Ireland*, no more belongs to the King, merely as King of *England*, than the Executive of *Scotland* did, before the Union, or that of *Hanover* now does. And there can be no other Necessity for our King's residing in *England*, than his being one and the same with the King of *England*, and consequently, unable to divide himself, other than by deputing his regal Power to proper Substitutes here, where the Executive must therefore necessarily lye. And all this, the Gentleman himself confesses, in the Conclusion of the Paragraph.

If then, the executive Power of *IRELAND* be, and must be delegated to some Vicegerent or Minister of the King, resident here, and sure it cannot be otherwise exercised, the with-drawing, or transferring, that Power from this, must be highly injurious, to both King and People, as the Kingdom cannot be supposed to exist without it. And if it may be with-drawn or transfered in Part, why not in the Whole?

I am not insensible, as the Author observes, p. 9, that the Privy Councils of either Kingdom, make no essential Part of the original Constitution of either Government. They are Persons, whose Creation and Existence alike, depend upon the Will of the Sovereign. And such Number or Particulars of them, as the King pleases to summon make the Council. Therefore happily, they make no essential Part of our Constitution.

But what will this Concession avail our Author?—It is certain the King usually exercises or directs his Executive Power in *ENGLAND*, by or in his Council. As it also is, that he vests his executive Power in *IRELAND* in his Vicegerent and Council here. There-

Therefore the withdrawing or transferring, the Power usually vested in a Person or Persons resident here, in one Instance, and that by an Act of Parleмент, is confessing that it is lawful and right to do so occasionally, in all Instances. And therefore the Injury is the same whether the Privy-Council, be or be not a legal, as they are made an actual, Part of the Constitution. Thus the learned Gentleman's Arguments appear to me, when stripped of the very ornamental and engaging Garb, in which his Oratory dresses them.

We are also agreed in the Appointment and Use of Ministers and Privy-Counsilors; as also that none of those resident in ENGLAND, can exercise any Part of the executive Power in IRELAND. But, MY LORD, is not this later Position disguised in a little Sophistry?—His Ministers resident in ENGLAND, can not take upon them any Part of the executive Power in IRELAND. But, by this Law, his Majesty, who has delegated his executive Power in IRELAND, to his Vicegerent here, is to exercise that or the dispensing Power, which is in this Instance the same Thing, in ENGLAND, regardless of those, who alone can be supposed qualified for the Task.

And because this is to be done by his Majesty in Person; in Council, in *Great Britain*, not by the positive Act of any Minister there: our ingenious Author is pleased to *challenge any Man to shew in what Instance, in what Light, this Act can in any Degree affect either the Executive or Legislative Powers of this Kingdom.* I flatter my self, this is unanswerably shewn in my first Address, and I find my Sentiments confirmed, upon looking into the Lords' Journal, where a Protest is entered against the passing this Act. And therefore, however elegantly the Gentleman argues to the contrary, *page 9, 10;* I am persuaded upon a Review of his Work, he will retract his Opinion.

Why the learned Gentleman supposes, that when the Heads of the Bill passed the Commons, there was

no Expectation of their returning, I can no more conceive, than I can admit that it was so very extraordinary an Act of Clemency to permit a wretched People to keep their small Stock of Grain at home to prevent a Famine. I can not view the Majesty of our King in so disadvantageous a Light, as that in which this Gentleman presumes to place it. Would he think that the preserving a loyal People from Famine, at their own sole Expence, is such a wonderful Condescension and Grace? Poor *Ireland*, how cheap art thou held, regardless of your invariable Loyalty! No wonder then, that there was not much Time necessary for Machinations of Ministers: For, by the Author's Hints, we may judge they are always premeditatedly prepared; and we have too good Grounds for Jealousies and Fears.

But if this Alteration be really no more than a *Bugbear*, or a *Shadow*, and tremendous through our Want of Discernment, to what End was it made? to what Purpose was it so violently insisted on, so rapidly passed? Or, if it was advantageous and honorable, how come it was not better received and countenanced by the Great Ones, who openly disavowed it to their Friends?

Our Wonder at all that our Author has said about this Alteration must cease; when we find, p. 11, that he tells us, *that the Alteration is in fact, no Alteration at all*. Withhold your Smiles or Admiration, till you hear the Reason; *his Majesty in both Councils is one and the same individual Person*. What shall I call this? I am too tender of the learned Author to name it. — Shall we say, that because the natural Person of the King of *England* and *Ireland* is one and the same, and indivisible, that his Subjects of all his Dominions are not to separate, divide and distinguish his political Capacity? Shall his Subjects of *Hanover*, or of *Ireland*, obey him merely as King of *England*? Is not their Allegiance due to him, merely as Elector of *Hanover*, or as

as King of *Ireland*? And is not the Homage of the *British* Subjects payed him, purely as King of *Great-Britain*, not as King of *Ireland*, or *France*, or Elector of *Hanover*? Sure, MY LORD, I may be allowed to call this Sophistry below the Dignity of our learned Author.

His sneering Distinction between the *Irish* and the *English Night-Gown*, and the comparing these to the Privy Council of both Kingdoms, are much of a Piece. If his Majesty were to be distinguished by particular Habits or Diadems, proper to his several Kingdoms and Dominions, in the Discharge of the regal Office to them respectively; it would certainly be an improper, perhaps a dangerous Innovation, to put on the Dress or Diadem of one Nation, when he appeared to the Subjects of another. How would the *British* Parleament like to see their King ascend the Throne of *England*, attired in his Electoral Habit and Coronet, instead of the Imperial Crown and Robes of *Britain*? And sure the Argument must hold somewhat stronger with respect to the Privy-Council. How would the *British* Subjects like having Orders conceived to rule them in the Council of *Hanover*, when some of our Kings resided in that Part of their Dominions? or by Orders made in the Council of *Ireland*, if his Majesty should reside in this Kingdom? These, I shall leave to the cool Reflection of our Author and the Reader, without offering any Answer of mine own.

But, if this Alteration could arise onely from the Blunder of a Clerk of the Hanaper, as our Author seems to believe, p. 11, pray why all the Expedition and Violence in passing it first? and justifying it now? And what is meant by Mr. *Lucas's* jocular Intimation, I am too dull to discover, without taking a Trouble, which is not worth while.

I am under the disagreeable Necessity of pointing out some other material Points of difference between
this

this ingenious Author and me, p. 12; here, he says, *thus the utmost Benefit sought by the Bill, was the preventing the Exportation of our Corn for a while. And the greatest admissable Evil, the denying the Royal Approbation to it, which would leave it liable to be exported.*

The First, I grant; but the Second, I deny. Because I think the actual Death of the greatest Number, that could be supposed to die of the once imagined Famine, the Fears of which were otherwise happily removed, a much less Evil than the political Death of the whole Kingdom for which the *Alteration* layed a Foundation.

The sliding Assertion, that his Majesty declined to *indulge us in a certain minute Article of ours* is not true. The Reverse indeed is the Truth, that we were granted infinitely more than we could ask or expect, or rather in the Grant, were deprived of the Benefit of the executive Power, essentially inherent to us as a Kingdom—And thus to secure us our own Pittance of Bread, in Time of Need, we were put under the Necessity of accepting a Precedent for a fatal Innovation in our Constitution. If this be the Case, which neither is, nor can be denied, the rest of our Author's Paragraph is a mere jingle of sophistical Expressions, derogatory from Truth, and therefore inconsistent with the Dignity of the Author and the Subject.

The Conclusions he draws, from his imaginary Examination of the Argument, are equally fallacious and insidious, though far from his Intentions. Neither this Gentleman, nor any of the King's Subjects, can have a more perfect Sense of Duty to, or repose more Confidence in his present Majesty, than I do. I am hurt at the frequent mentioning the Royal Name, in this Dispute. But as it seems to be but a Word of Office, very familiar in the Mouths of Ministers, under which they often skreen themselves, I must also use it, as the Author does, and probably in the same Sense; for I must suppose

suppose, that for Majesty, he generally understands Ministry. I beg he will in this Instance, give me leave to join with him, and in the Word King or Majesty, mean Minister or Ministry. And for these, I think the Gentleman so zealous an Advocate, that I begin to conceive some Suspicion, that he is of the Number.

“All the Precedent,” says he, “this Act affords, is a Precedent that declares, that his Majesty, even in Matters, where his Judgment is different, will never attempt any Thing without our Concurrence.”—While we are sensible, virtuous and free, he cannot do otherwise. “That he is pleased to derive his Authority from us”.—From whom alone he derives all the Authority and Power he possesses, and for whom he holds them in Trust. “That he is desirous of acting under the Appointment of our Legislature.”—As none other can give him new, or extend or limit the Powers he derives from our Laws.—“And that even the dispensing Power, confided to him by this Bill, assumes nothing as a Clame, arrogates nothing as a Prerogative, but submits to borrow all it's Efficacy, to take all its Force from the Act and Institution of our *Irish* Parlelament.”—Because no such Assumption of a Clame or Prerogative can have any Efficacy, Weight, Force or Authority, from any other Quarter, while the *Irish* Parlelament continues faithful to their King and Country—Does our learned Author advance the Cause of the Ministry by this Kind of Argument?—If he has any Employment, I fear he may lose it, for so weak a Defence, therefore in Charity, I will not venture to expose this further.

On the thirteenth Page, he is pleased to say, that *Mr. Lucas seems to complain, that the Heads of a Bill were sent in Compliance with Poynings's Law, to Great Britain.* I utterly deny the Insinuation. What he says of the *Prerogatorial Power of a Negative on Bills, and the inconclusive Right of proposing Amendments,*

ments in them, I have already answered. And the rest of the Paragraph is a pompous Parade, made upon the *insinuated Complaint*, which is offering an Injustice, at the Sight of which, the Author must blush and be set to Rights; For, if he means to do me Justice, he must confess, that my Speeches and Writings on this Subject, make the very same Complaint, which he says I should have made. If he be as candid and just, as I am inclined to believe, he will read this at least with Pleasure, as it will put him in the Method of doing himself and me Justice, which surely I have a Right to demand at his Hands.

I should be very glad to know what the learned Gentleman means, in a Controversy with me, about an Alteration in a Bill, to hawl in what I detest as much as he can; *straining at Gnats, swallowing Camels, leibargic and frightful Periods; Mock Patriots, Mob Magistracy, Mob Administration, &c. &c. &c.* Let the Gentleman speak plain, point out the Aggressors, and I will go as far as he or any Man in shewing my Contempt, Detestation and Abhorrence of the Men and the Measures. I should gladly know, whether this Part of his Work be, to be considered as the *roaring of a British Lion, or the Bleating of an Irish Calf, or the Braying of an Ass.*

The Gentleman would do well to inform himself, that the *Mock-Patriots*, and *Mob Magistrates*, and *Mob Administrations*, were produced from the same Source, EVIL GOVERNORS. These never fail of tempting vane and avaricious Men, to quit the Service of their Country, and enlist in the Bands of evil Ministers for a paltry Titule, or a pitiful Place or Pension; while by holding the Reins of Government unequally, irregularly, perhaps unjustly, or by some wanton, oppressive Exertion of Power, they drive sober and inoffensive Men to Distraction and Desperation; and then as the Devil serves his Dupes, theslike devilish Governors, expose and persecute the Wretches they have

have thus perverted.——Let us have no such Governors, and we shall keep clear of these Reproaches to Government. What unpardonable Insolence to the present virtuous Administration, to hint at what was done by the worst Governors that ever infested this Kingdom!

As for the Mobs, I have not had the Misfortune of seeing or hearing of any since my Return from Exile; except that which broke open our Gaol and trampled the Civil Power under Foot. Yet these are passed over as quite inoffensive by our Author. Shall we say, here is *Hay on the Horn?* *A Snake in the Grass?*—Hush! not a Word of that; for had the making a general Gaol Delivery by military Force been a Crime, our late Government would undoubtedly have had the Offenders punished by the offended Civil Power.

And as for the *Mock-Patriots*, I am as willing to have them, and those who made them, exposed, as our learned Author can be.

But I must think the Gentleman treats the Subject of Mock-Patriotism not so fully as it deserves, and without keeping up the proper Distinction between the true and the false Patriot.

Patriot and Patriotism, are now no longer considered as real, but ideal Characters. That they were once otherwise, our Author will confess. And I hope, he is taught by his own Heart to believe, that there are yet some Men in the World, who are ready and willing to sacrifice, upon a proper Occasion, their Time, their Fortunes, their Healths, their Lives, to the Service of their Country.

That designing Men have often layed hold of trifling, as well as weighty Occasions, to set forth their own Importance, to gain their private Ends; and that great and important Subjects taken up apparently, with just and public-spirited Views, have been given up and forsaken, when the Ministry
have

have thrown out the proper Lure, are notorious, as they are hateful.

That the Royal Consent was once anticonstitutionally, yet without Opposition, inserted in an Act of Parleмент, and that at another Time, the Proposition was constitutionally spurned at, and rejected in the same Parleмент, is certainly true. That many Patriots arose upon this great Occasion, while the Funds were redundant in the Treasury, is true. But that these were short lived Pageants is as true. That some lost their Places, some their Pensions, for a while, is certain; but that the chopping and changing, placing and pensioning, and replacing and repensioning *these Patriots*, cost the Nation about half a Million, is as certain.—As it is, that while they justly contended for the Right of Parleмент to the Disposal of the Redundance of the Funds in the Treasury, they afterwards peaceably suffered it to be drawn out of the Treasury by the sole Mandate of the Crown. And thus, it must be confessed, that ours, like other Patriots, have been but the Pageants of a Day, each acting their Parts like the poor Player, *who frets and struts his Hour upon the Stage, and then is heard no more.*

But what is all this to the present Purpose? Because there have been many pretending, false Patriots, is the Name and Character to be treated with Contempt? And are we, for this Reason, no longer to look upon Patriotism as an *operative Principle*, but as a *Word to ride on to Preferment*? If our learned Author knows of any such base Characters among us, he would do well to set a Mark upon them. I stand foremost in the Number of those, who set him and the World at Defiance.

And for the Warning, our Author gives your Lordship and the Citizens, that *if You are not desirous that a Spirit of Dominion should not rise into any Excess pernicious to Liberty, let not Liberty break Bounds into any Excesses pernicious to Government and the Constitution*; it sounds like an odd Sort of a Threat in my Ears.—And I can not conceive why it should be addressed to You, who are the most loyal and well affected of all the King's Subjects.

Our Author's Notion of Liberty, seems also some what odd. *Liberty with him, breaks Bounds! commits Excesses! &c.*—How is it possible? Liberty must ever be subject and amenable to the Laws. It is Libertinism and Licentiousness, that cause those Excesses. Let them be punished, wherever

wherever they are found. Sure, MY LORD, we shall ever appear to stand clear of the Charge.

On Page 14, 15, I stand accused of some Indelicacy of Expression towards a great Man. And though the Charge is made with Lenity, and seems to be palliated with Tenderness; I must beg the Indulgence of your Lordship, and Honors in offering a Justification of my Conduct upon this Head.

In my first Address, as well as in former Papers, I have given some Account of *Poyning's* Law, and of the Statute of the third and fourth of *Philip* and *Mary*, explanatory of that Law. After this I ask, p. 10, 11, shall it appear, that greater Regard was had, both by the Crown and the Parlemtent, to the Freedom and Rights of the Parlemtent and People of *Ireland*, in those dark and cruel Days, than in the inlightened golden Age of that blessed Son of the glorious Revolution, GEORGE the Third?—On all this, however, our learned Critic makes no Animadversion: The calling the Conduct of Majesty in question seems with him a *venial*, *political* Sin, while the slightest Glance at his Lieutenant appears a capital, and mortal Sin.

Please, MY LORD, to examine the Words themselves with Strictness and Justice, and see whether they will admit of any Degree of evil Meaning or Design, when I first inform You, that upon the first Question on the altered Bill, after the House adjourned, the Members were solemnly assured, upon the Honor of a great Man, usually well versed in the Ways and Secrets of Government, that the Alteration in the Bill, was no Measure of his Excellency, nor one approved by him, and that he was authorised to declare this for his Excellency, as he also did for himself. To which, I immediately answered, that his Excellency should be acquitted of the Blame, and that *the Saddle should be set on the right Horse*, meaning the Gentlemen who took upon them to support the Measure, as if it had been patronised by the Lord Lieutenant. And I attempted to fulfil my Promise, but was borne down by a Torrent of Impetuosity, not necessary to be explained here.

Now, MY LORD and GENTLEMEN, examine the Words themselves, in which, I am sayed to glance hypothetical Reflections: They are these, *And what wicked Enemy to our most gracious King, and to the present patriot Administration*

E

could

could contrive a Scheme, which, if it should take Place, must prove at once dishonourable to the Crown, and likely to inroll the unblemished, the illustrious Name of SEYMOUR in the Black List of Poynings, Radcliff, Burnell, &c. &c. Names which must be handed down to latest Posterity, with Anathemas and Infamy?—I still hope, you will be the happy Instruments, to prevent such a shameful, destructive Scheme's taking place, and that by interposing your just Influence, and regularly opposing this Bill in every Estate or Branch of the Legislature, You will be able to frustrate Measures, likely to prove so injurious to the Honor and Dignity of our most gracious Sovereigne and his worthy Vicegerent, and in the End, so fatal to the Constitution of this Kingdom.

Let these be scaned with the utmost Malignity, and I think all honest Hearts will clearly acquit me, of the most distant Intention to commit the Faults or Inadvertencies, which the Author by a palliative Exculpation seems to fasten upon me.

MY LORD, my Character is known to you all, and thank God! approved by all that dare be honest and free. I challenge my direst Foe to charge a single Instance of Flattery upon me, to Kings, or even to more mighty Ministers. You know my invaried Love and Loyalty to my King, and you know my declared Motives. Had I not had these, I should have scorned to prostitute the offered Incense.

A just Proportion of the Regard due to the Sovereigne, I have ever been ready to pay to his Representative; unless the Conduct of the Substitute provoked me to say, with the insulted free Apostle, *God shall smite thee, thou whited Wall*; for I should not be provoked more than the holy Man, had I not the same Apology, might I not say, as he did, when rebuked, *Erethren, I wist not that he was God's high Priest*; because he stripped and degraded himself of the Power and Dignity of his Office, by commanding a free Citizen to be *smitten*, in open Court, contrary to Law, Justice, and Decency.

What good and worthy Vicegerent of the Crown, wanted my poor Applause? What bad and unworthy Lieutenant escaped my poor Censure? You see then, I have ever loved, respected and revered those great Officers of the Crown, or hated, despised and contemned them, according to their well proved Merit or Demerit.

My Conduct in private and in public Life, always did,
and

and always shall, prove these Truths. Witness the different Treatments, by me given to the Lords CHESTERFIELD and *Harrington, Hallifax* and NORTHUMBERLAND. In all which, you know, I acted upon invariable Principles.

My Conduct in these Instances, will convince you, that I always have acted, as I always shall act, as a Person, who for himself, *has nothing to ask, and nothing to fear*, which must always keep me a free Agent.

To stand quite clear of all Suspicion of Adulation, I should have declined expressing my Sentiments of the present Lord Lieutenant, till the Expiration of his Office. But, as I am called upon, I must explaine myself, in mine own Justification.

I could not have lived as long as I did in *London*, without being well acquainted with the Character of our present Viceroy. I confess, I honored and admired it, before I had the Honor of being known to him. And, when I petitioned his present Majesty, against his wicked Ministers and Judges in *Ireland*, I had the good Fortune to find myself, from the Justice of my Cause, patronised by this Great Good Man, who then knew no more of me, than my Character, and who did me the Honor to present me, and heard and saw me make my Complaint to the Royal Ear.

To him, I confess myself indebted for that Share of the Royal Clemency, with which I now stand distinguished. If my Return to my native Country, be grateful to my Countrymen and Fellow Citizens, the Obligation is due to the Lord HERTFORD, who, in spite to great and mighty Powers, made my Case known to our Patriot King, who embraces every Opportunity of testifying his parental Love for his faithful Subjects.

His Excellency has since deigned to confer Marks of his Favor on some of my Family. So that your Lordship and Honours see, that I stand under singular Obligations, for my Country, my Family and myself, to the Lord Lieutenant.

It may possibly be suspected, that from Principles of Gratitude for private Favors, I may have been blinded to, or prejudiced in Favor of the Great Man's public Conduct.

I hope my Character is too well known to fall under this Imputation.—I have never yet been able to pay my Devoirs in Person to his Excellency; consequently, I could
never

never have sayed what the Author pleased to say for me, that I acquit him of *Closetings and Squeezings*, and such like *customary Arts*. Let *Placemen and Pensioners*, a Band in which I shall never inlist, testify this. I hope every Man can. I hope, they are Arts, which no Lord Lieutenant will ever dare to practise on this virtuous Parlement, and I verily believe, the present Ruler detests such Practices as much as I do.

In public and in private, I have thought myself bound to justify this great Character. Without having had any Intercourse with him or his Ministers, I saw many Proofs of his public Spirit, agreeable to the Hopes I had conceived from his general Character, and his being more interested than any of his Predecessors, in the Freedom and Happiness of this Kingdom.

These, I confess, gave me Confidence in his Excellency, and I gladly layed hold on two Instances that proved my Judgment; his Conduct, when an unasked for, not to say unnecessary, Vote or Act of Credit was offered, and when the Alteration in the Corn Bill came over. Here I confess myself, in the onely Instances of my Life, under some Degree of what you may call Court Influence. For, this was such a Conduct as raised him still higher in my Esteem, and I did him the Justice to declare my Sentiments, as I also should, and shall do, if his future Conduct should possibly, as I hope it shall not, induce me to change my Sentiments.

What signifies our Author's Reproof for the *pretended Inadvertency*?—It is true, I never did, nor could intend to glance the most distant Reflection on the Character of his Excellency. But let it not by this be imagined, that I would not stand foremost in accusing, in impeaching this honoured Benefactor and Friend of mine, regardless of all private Obligations, if it were possible, that in a single Point of his public Conduct he should act unworthy of his Principal, attempt to influence the Freedom of Parliament, or to incroach upon the Rights or Liberties of the Subject.

What our Author means by *STATION-BAITING*, and the *lower Class of our Fellow Citizens*, I am too insensible to conceive, and consequently unable to answer. We know no Distinction of Citizens. But our Fellow Citizen, the Author, I fear, takes the Rabble for his Brethren, in which, surely he must be mistaken.

I beg

I beg leave to goe a little further than the reverend *Homer* and our honored Author, and say, *that the Day which makes a Man a Slave, takes away, NOT half, but ALL his Worth.* A Slave in human Form, is in my Estimation worse than a Beast in any Form. I also confess, that the lawless Libertine forfeits his Clame and Titule to Liberty. — And that Licentiousness becomes the worst Kind of Tyranny.

Let the galled Jade wince, MY LORD, Our Witbers are unwrung.—What means our Author, by recommending it to our Magistrates, to keep this *Bear of a Mob chained?* — What *Mob?* What *Bear, MY LORD?* Does the learned Gentleman mean the *military Savages*, that lately broke open our Gaol, and discharged the Criminals? — And yet were delivered up by the broken and abused Civil Power into the Hands of the *mock Military Tribunal*, unknown to our Laws?

O! No; It is the Mode to abuse the Citizens; to represent the loyal regular Corporations of this City, legally convened in their Halls, and performing lawful Deeds, as a rude, uncivilised, barbarous Mob. Yea more, a paltry, pensionary, Placeman, in an Office, the most expensive and burdensom to this Kingdom, and useful onely to the Incumbents, dares, under a Masque, to go still farther in Abuse, to call some of the best Subjects, the associated Tradesmen of this City, *Rats, Cats, Dogs, and Animals of inferior Note.* Are we to consider this, and calling them a *Mob, a Bear*, by our Author, as a new Method of paying Court? I can not suspect it. But suppose these as well as a leading Gentleman in the City, who owes his Rank and Honor to the Citizens, whom he now vilifies and abuses in Return for their late generous, but misplaced Regards, have mistaken their Point and their Man, and hoped to gain further Favors, *Compensations*, for these infamous Slanders. But, I hope, we shall see them treated by their Masters, as every Gentleman must use such Servants of his, as abuse his honest Neighbours. The least we can expect, is to see these insolent Fellows, for the Sake of Justice and of Peace, cashiered with the Infamy they deserve.

What Sort of Compliment do these foolish Men pay Government, when they talk of Mobs to a Patriot Administration? Can they shew a single Instance, where the Citizens, or any of the most rude Rabble ever offered an Insult or a Slight, to a good Lord Lieutenant? I defy them.

And, as it is not to be presumed, that a Person of the Family and Character of our present Lord Lieutenant, could
accept

accept of this great Office, with any other Views, than those of fully and fairly representing the best of Kings to the most affectionate and loyal of Subjects; while he lives up to the Character which he has hitherto maintained, I know the honest Spirits of the Citizens so well, that I dare be an Hostage, that his Excellency will find a more faithful Guard in the Citizens of *Dublin*, than in any of the mercenary Satelites that surround him, or the Bands of Slaves and Flatterers that infest his Court.

We shall not MY LORD, be like the *Jews*, who mal-treated every Messenger from Heaven. But as the King loves all his worthy Servants, so shall we *delight in honoring him, whom the King loveth.*

I have the Honor of being with great Truth and Sincerity,

MY LORD, and GENTLEMEN,

Your ever faithful

and dutiful Representative,

Henry-street,

Jan. 25, 1766.

and most obedient Servant,

C. Lucas.

P. S. As I have taken the Liberty to alter a Word, in the Motto of the great SIDNEY, and put *Lege* for *Ense*; I would recommend to our Author to make as free with his, from *Virgil*, and give us *Actis*, for *Dictis*; for they must be Actions or Deeds, not *soothing Words* alone, that can bring our disturbed Minds to their native Tranquility.



